

REMARKS

Election/Restrictions:

Claims 14, 21, 24, 25, 27-31, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50-52, 56-58, 60, and 61-68 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner in the Office Action. The Examiner thereafter takes the position that "support for the specific materials and material properties is not provided for the embodiments of Species 6." In the event that the Examiner withdrew any claims from consideration on these grounds, Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to page 18, lines 2-12 in relation to various materials/properties that are applicable to the vibration dampers used by the various embodiments disclosed by the subject patent application, as well as statements such as that at page 40, lines 9-13 of the subject patent application.

Drawing Objections:

The Examiner has objected to the drawings in relation to Claim 23 and its reference to the first and second vibration dampers being made of the same material. Page 6, lines 18-19 of the patent application as filed indicates that first and second vibration dampers may be formed from the same or different materials. Figure 10 clearly shows a pair of longitudinally space vibrations dampers 570A and 570B. This, combined with the above-noted statement, is more than sufficient for one skilled in the art to understand the claimed invention. That is, Applicant does not believe that it is necessary or required for there to be another cross-sectional view similar to Figure 10, with the only difference being the type of cross-hatching used for the vibration dampers 570A and 570B. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the issue and withdraw the outstanding objection to the drawings.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings in relation to the "vibration damper comprising means for maintain the contact pin in a set position." No claim number was specified in the Office Action in relation to this issue. Upon a review of the claims, Applicant assumes the Examiner is referring to independent Claim 59. Applicant refers the Examiner to page 24, lines 13-17 of the patent application as filed for a discussion on using a vibration damper for retaining a desired relative position between a contact pin and a body of a push-pin assembly. This passage indicates that this "position retention function" may be provided by a press fit. Therefore, Applicant believes that no change to the drawings is required.

The Examiner has also objected to the drawings in relation to "pin shaft 352", "first protrusion 577" and "protrusion 577" not being shown in Figure 10. These three instances are the result of typographical errors in the specification, which have been corrected as noted above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

Specification Objections:

The Examiner objected to the specification based upon the existence of a typographical error at page 19, line, 22, which has been corrected as noted above. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Independent Claim Rejections:

Pending independent Claims 1, 32, 33, 45, 53, and 59 are each directed a method for performing servo writing operations on a disk drive having a first disk and a first head. Each claim includes the steps of positioning a push-pin assembly of the servo writer relative to the disk drive, moving the push-pin assembly relative to the first disk, moving the first head relative to the first disk

in response to this movement of the push-pin assembly, and forming a plurality of data storage tracks on the first disk. Applicant refers the Examiner to page 16, line 20 through page 17, line 8, of the patent application as filed, as well as page 19, line 18 through page 21, line 5, for a related discussion. Each of these independent claims then further specifies various details regarding the associated push-pin assembly.

Each of independent Claims 1, 32, 33, 45, 53, and 59 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based upon U.S. Patent No. 5,727,882 to Butler et al. (hereafter '882 Patent). The '882 Patent is directed to a pivot bearing in a disk drive, as indicated by its title ("PIVOT BEARING ASSEMBLY PROVIDING DAMPING FOR UNIT-TO-UNIT CONSISTENCY"), as well as throughout the remainder of the disclosure of the '882 Patent. Generally, a disk drive pivot bearing is that structure that rotatably interconnects the disk drive housing (typically the base plate) with the head stack assembly (e.g., an actuator body with one or more actuator arms, and a corresponding number of load beams/suspensions and head gimbal assemblies). A pivot bearing is not a push-pin or a push-pin assembly of the type that is used in servo writing operations, which is the subject of the subject patent application. A push-pin or push-pin assembly is not part of the disk drive, but instead is part of the servo writer that is used to write tracks on the disk(s) of disk drives in a servo writing operation. Although Applicant's characterization of the invention as a "push-pin assembly" in the claims as filed in and of itself is sufficient to patentably distinguish the same from the disclosure of '882 Patent, Applicant has emphasized the totally different nature of a push-pin assembly of a servo writer from a pivot bearing of a disk drive by the additional method steps that were added to each of the pending independent claims.

Based upon the foregoing, all pending independent claims, as well as their corresponding dependent claims, are allowable over the '882 Patent. There is therefore no need to separately

address the patentability of each of these claims and/or the Examiner's interpretation in relation to any of these claims or any of the references of record in relation thereto.

PTO Form 1449 and PTO Form 892

Applicant acknowledges receipt of the Examiner's consideration of the references on the noted forms. Not all of these references published more than one year before the priority date of the above-noted patent application. Applicant reserves the right to address any subsequent rejection by the Examiner using any one or more of these references by filing an appropriate affidavit under 37 CFR §1.131.

Conclusion:

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such a disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

James L. Johnson
Registration No. 34,193
3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411
Aurora, Colorado 80014
(701) 293-7680

Date: 8/11/03